DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 158 933 RC 010 693

AUTHOR Lionberger, Herbert F.; Pope, LaVern A.
TITLE Types and Role Performance of the Extension Field Staff in a Midwestern University.
PUB DATE 9 Aug 78
NOTE 35p.; Tables I and III may not reproduce well due to small print size of original

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Farmer Education; *Behavior Patterns; Communication (Thought Transfer); Community Development; *Extension Agents; *Extension Education; Individual Development; *Information Dissemination; *Information Networks; Problem Solving; Q Sort; Research Utilization; *Role Perception; Rural Areas; Teacher Role; University Extension
IDENTIFIERS Missouri

ABSTRACT

To identify and describe extension role types, all educational assistants in the Small Farm Program, agricultural specialists, and community development and local government specialists in Missouri were asked to fill out questionnaires asking how frequently they performed 56 activities broadly representing what extension field staff might do. Analysis of data from the 249 respondents was done by Q-methodology plus factor analysis. Five distinctive modes of operation were defined as teacher therapist, teacher extensionist, people-oriented problem solvers, public servant, and extension activist. Though some differences existed, as a whole, extension staff most emphasized roles conducive to developing managerial and problem-solving capabilities of their clients. Secondarily, they operated as conveyors of information from the university; no role type operated primarily as hard sell information conveyors. Agricultural specialists and educational assistants stressed information-conveyor and client-protector roles more than in community development and were more inclined to communicate in-field informational needs back to researchers. Educational assistants involved clients in extension programs and trained local leaders less than did subject matter specialists. Community development specialists helped clients achieve their objectives more through organized group effort and agency linkages. (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TYPES AND ROLE PERFORMANCE OF THE EXTENSION FIELD STAFF IN A MIDWESTERN UNIVERSITY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Herbert F. Lionberger

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

- ED158933

RC 010693

Rev. 8/9/78

Herbert F. Lionberger and LaVern A. Pope*

I. Rationale and Perspective

This study proposes (1) to identify and describe typical ways that agricultural and community development specialists in Missouri and educational assistants (paraprofessionals) in the Small Farmer Program (Wiggins 1974) operate in the field and (2) address questions often raised about role differentiation and orientation of the in-field extension activity.

The Information Macrosystem Context

The position taken is that any such study had better be viewed in the context of establishing and maintaining a proper interface between the informational resource base and the ultimate information user. Implicit assumptions are that the information is basically science based and that specialized systems are required to develop and disseminate it. In informational situations where this system for transforming scientific theory into usable information is not feasible, either because the basic theories are lacking or where the utilitarian information supply base is otherwise deficient, a somewhat reverse bottom-up procedure or even point-to-point information development and dissemination may be required. In this case usable innovations are put together in the field, usually with the help of scientists, extension workers and users, after which it is tested for local adaptibility. If the test is successful it is either disseminated directly

* On the staff of the Department of Rural Sociology of the University of Missouri, Columbia.

to local users or more broadly, after additional validation through official informational system (Emerick 1977, Hilderbrand 1977, Wong 1977). This is the type of situation in which community development and rural development representatives must often operate. The situation for the agricultural field staff in extension is more likely to be one of delivering already tested and validated information from a research base to users. Irrespective of the mode of generating and disseminating the new information, the whole operation becomes something of an information macrosystem in which the information dissemination function as such becomes basically a specialized activity supported by an interlinked subsystem designed to take care of the dissemination purpose (Havelock 1971, Lionberger 1977, Coughenour 1968).

Conceptualization of Extension Roles

Roles that must be performed to make the system work may be conceptualized in terms of the total information development, transformation and delivery process (Clark and Hopkins 1966, Lionberger 1977) in terms of the linking process only (Nielson 1967) or in terms of the larger information dissemination subsystem requirements. It is the last perspective that is taken in this paper.

Since the intent in this study was to be as exhaustive as possible in terms of extension roles performed a near full range of likely roles was needed.

To do this, the authors have drawn heavily on agricultural extension studies and the exhaustive work of Havelock (1971, Ch.7). This was supplemented by in depth interviews with professionals either working as linking agents or those working in close collaboration with them. After

noting the roles and activities that have been conceptualized by others and the additional ones arising from the interviews we will take note of some charges that have been made and questions posed about how the extension field staff are alleged to operate.

Although those occupying agricultural extension positions seem to have disagreed, they have nevertheless been occassionally viewed mostly as conveyors of information (Abraham 1963, Wilkening 1956, Stone 1952). In fact, this over simplified conception of the linking role seemingly built into early attempts to establish linkages between research resources in education and in-field use may have been one of the reasons why attempts to use the "so called" agricultural extension model was not particularily successful (Rogers, Eveland and Bean 1977).

Teacher trainer roles have been identified by Havelock (1971: 7-9), and others; a kind of information funneling role by Ashby (1962); gatekeeper roles by Lewin (1963); facilitator roles by Reiff and Riessman (1964); and a kind of translator-adapter way of operating by Wilkening (1956). A process facilitating and/or catalyst mode of operation was observed by Lippet et al (1958) and a consultant stance has been noted by Havelock (1971: 7-6). The last is assumed to include such additional roles and/or activities as facilitator, helper, objective observer, problem diagonistian, resource finder, and information retriever.

A client defender role which urges caution in accepting questionable innovations has been seriously posed by Francis and Rogers (1960). This role is also implicit in the admonition to assess consequences carefully before acting (Rogers and Shoemaker 1972). Even innovator (demonstrator of new things), legitimator and opinion leadership roles have been suggested,

but usually with some question of whether a professional change agent can really serve in any of these ways (Havelock 1971:7, 10-15, Rogers 1962). Brown and Deekins (1958) add student, promotor, interpretor, writer, administrator, evaluator, and program organizer-developer roles. Perhaps most recently of all is the social activist role implied in the structual change stance of Beltran (1977).

Also, extension appointed personnel are occassionally expected to administer government programs. This is true of the public office extension worker in Taiwan (Lionberger and Chang 1970) and in considerable degree also, in such U.S. agency programs as those designed to get soil conservation practices on the land and to provide loans to low income farmers who are expected to accept farm management supervision as a condition for getting a loan.

Sometimes the extension staff is asked to do things that they regard as nothing more than chores, e.g., serving as a club secretary, putting on a feeder calf sale, or filling out government forms for clients. Such chore-like activities were common in the early days of agricultural extension in the State (Longwell 1970).

In talking with specialists about their in-field activities still other roles or activities were evident. Teaching skills to clients was often encountered. Also, it was quite obvious that the extension staff was occassionally involved in boundary maintenance and public relations activities. There was an additional more subtle therapist-ego enhancement role manifest especially in the way educational assistants related to their clients. Allegedly, they spent much time listening to, visiting with, taking note of achievements and encouraging the clients with whom they worked.

How then can a study dedicated to an exhaustive treatment of extension roles be conceptualized and operationalized for research purposes. The authors chose to do this in the context ofthe following role designations:

Catalyst
Social Facilitator (people involvement)
Linking Role (systemic linkage)
Information Conveyor
Protector
Therapist-ego enhancement
Teacher (personal development)
Teacher (trainer)
Boundary Maintenance
Generalized Helper (choreboy)
Administrative Director
Lobbyist (public relations)
Social Action (activist)

In addition to these general role types for which 3 to 5 representative statements each were provided, there were additional matters of general orientation namely; an elitist versus egalitarian stance in the teaching effort and the matter of whether extension is mostly taken to clients or whether clients are expected to come to extension. The last poses a more general question of whether extension works primarily with those who request help or those most in need of it.

Operational Questions

What then are the questions to be addressed and the underlying rationale for asking them? The first derives in part from changes in the specialized training of field staff and its likely in-field consequences. The generalist county agent of times past performed many roles (Longwell 1970). In fact, this mode of operation has been labelled as a major reason for high success achieved by change agents in agriculture (Havelock 1971:7-3). Conversely, an inclination to define roles to narrowly has sometimes been suspected

of contributing to the lack of extension success (Rogers, Eveland and Bean 1977). However, with the professionalization of extension, the inclination seems to have been to restrict the extension role essentially to educational matters. This has tended to exclude other things that need to be done. The question is whether the extension roles have been restricted with the assignment of subject matter specialists to the field in contrast to generalists of days past.

The second derives from an elitist charge that has been directed to the whole agricultural research extension system including those who are a part of it. Extension in the agricultural setting has been accused of an elitist stance characterized by a top down kind of operation in which information developed at center is persumed to be the message about which clients are to be persuaded. This is in contrast to a egalitarian stance presumed to be more of an appropriate ideal (Roling et al 1976). All are regarded as being part of a system that exploits the masses to benefit the priviliged (Beltran 1976). It has been suggested that the net result is to create an information gap between those who know much and those who know little (Shingi and Mody 1976, Tichenor 1970, Rogers 1974).

In view of the forgoing, we might expect an extension mode of operation quite in accord with the information conveyor role model to emerge, perhaps, additionally characterized by an elitist stance. Some agricultural specialists might be inclined to this mode of operation. In contrast, community development specialists trained mostly as generalists and strongly dedicated to a social process and interactional type of orientation might be expected to embrace a more egalitarian social process facilitating role type. Also, in accord with the specialization inclination roles

performed might be expected to be somewhat more restricted then the county agents to which Havelock alluded. Although these questions are not posed as general hypotheses to be tested, they are addressed as one part of the analysis in which definition of extension role types are central.

II. Methodology

All educational assistants in the Small Farm Program, all agricultural specialists, and all community development and local government specialists in the state of Missouri were asked to indicate how frequently they performed 56 activities that broadly represented what extension field staff might do. These we have observed were conceptualized under 12 role categories thought to be broadly inclusive of the range of extension roles actually or likely to be performed (See Table 1). Since the central objective of the study was to identify and describe extension role types, Q-methodology plus factor analysis was chosen as an appropriate methodology (Kerlinger 1973). Q-methodology permits a broad definition of extension activities and interviewee responses in terms of the relative frequency with which each activity is stressed or avoided by the respondents. The forced choice placement closely approximates a normal distribution. It is assumed to provide an accurate indicator of the manner in which staff members operate in the field with respect to the activities included.

Traditionally, and with few exceptions Q sorts have been card sorting operations administered to small samples of persons selected for maximum diversity (Stephenson 1953). For large samples this can be tedious and difficult. Our approach was to incorporate a modified Q sort arrangement into the questionnaire which was administered to all of the extension field staff.

Each of the 56 activities was followed by a 5 level frequency scale (never, seldom, occasionally, generally, always). The respondent was asked to check for each activity the frequency with which he or she performed that activity. After having read and checked the frequency of all activities the respondent was asked to enter the numbers of the three statements that most represented the way he or she works. Then, the respondent was asked to pick the four statements that next most represented his or her manner of operation. At the other end of the continuum, the respondent then picked the three statements that least represented his or her mode of operation; and then the four that next least represented his or her work.

The design incorporates features of card Q-sorts, particularly the limited response choice and the rating of at least some items against the others. What is not present in this design is the forced normal distribution. Opinions concerning the forced normal design are mixed. According to Kerlinger (1972) however, the form of the distribution may not make too much difference. Respondents were not limited in the number of items they could put in each frequency category, but they were asked to draw out each end of the continuum. By forcing three, then four statements to be sorted to the ends, the most important aspect of Q-sort can be achieved. Certain items appear as most representative of the individual and others appear as least representative. Q factor analysis then should allow us to determine the types of roles extension field workers perform.

The factor analysis necessary to define and describe role types requires (1) maximum diversity of activities, which was achieved in the item sample and (2) maximum diversity of respondents. Since the 34 educational assistants were a diverse lot and since the community development and government specialists were only 29 in number all were included. Only

24 of the 130 agricultural specialists were included. These were identified by knowledgeables who indicated that each operated in a somewhat distinct manner. Not good or bad different; just different. The modified Q sorts of these 87 individuals then formed the data from which role performance factors were extracted.

Q factor analysis was used to detect and define typical modes of operations or role types. A standard score was computed for each item to indicate the general frequency of each activity. The approximate range was from -3 (strongly avoid) to +3 (very frequently do). Typical ways of operating in the field were then extracted using an on-file computer program specifically designed for Q factor analysis.

A five factor solution was chosen because it seemed to capture the major ways of operating without exaggerating small differences. The items were arranged on a most represents to a least represents continuum for each factor. This item arrangement provides the basis for describing each type. Also available were how each type differed from the average, how each type was like each of the others, and how each differed from each of the others. Item standard scores for each role type are reported in Table 1.

III. Results

(A) Role Types

The objective here was to define and describe characteristic modes of in-field operation - role types. In so doing certain commonalities along with differences are always found. Modes of operation upon which there was little variance in frequency of use are referred to as "consensus operations". These we look at first; then differences that defined the 5 types. These we named teacher therapist, extensionist teachers, people oriented problem solvers, people servants and extension activists.[2]

[2]Naming of types is a wholly subjective process. Maybe you can suggest better ones.

Concensus Operations.

There were items for which variations in frequency or regularity of use on the minus 3 thru 0 to plus 3 standard score scale was less than one. Of these there were 19 out of 56, mostly in the seldom or occasionally do range. The major exception was that all consistently listened to and visited with their clients (33)[3]. They also emphasized taking extension to the people (35) and helping clients think through the consequence of what they are doing (26). With somewhat less frequency they took note of and expressed recognition to clients for their achievement (18); helped create an awareness of changes needed (22); conveyed research results from the university to clients who could use them (48); worked to achieve the goals that clients have set for themselves (11); urged caution in the adoption of questionable innovations (8); and promoted the adoption of recommended practices (12). There were ten things that they seldom or only occasionally did but there were no activities that all five role types consistently avoided.

Type I Teacher Therapists

Salient characteristics - Teacher therapists emphasized activities conducive to the personal development of their clients and de-emphasized those that were primarily administrative and authoritarian; also de-emphasized were chore-like activities and pressure tactics.

They emphasized most of all, visiting with and listening to clients (33). Next came a series of teaching activities conducive to the personal development of clients. This included encouraging them to consider alternatives (1); think through their problems (37); raise questions in order to clarify their thinking (7); and help them define what their problems really are (3). In a protector role the extension staff were inclined to help clients think through the consequences of what they were about to do (26).

---

[3]The numbers in parentheses are item (role statement) numbers that appear before each statement in tables 1 and 3

Their mode of operation was basically egalitarian and oriented to people improvement rather than purveyors of University generated information, and ideas. This is contrary to a contention by some that the extension staff act as if research generated ideas, practices and/or technology is the message about which clients are to be educated and persuaded.

Type I extension personnel were further characterized by operational modes contrary to the way they usually work. At the top of the avoid list, were such authoritarian tactics as putting pressure on those who get in the way of carrying out extension work (9), and using the threat of withdrawal of services for noncompliance (40). Also de-emphasized were chores like serving as local club leader and secretary (15); teaching clients to keep records (51) and helping make agency contacts (24). Likewise avoided were encouraging clients to depend on extension (36) and tactics like telling clients what to do and leaving the rest up to them (45). Also, in considerable disrepute were such social action tactics as organizing clients to demand rights (31) and mobilizing by-passed people for joint action against those who would take advantage of them (30). Another activity not stressed was carrying out directives from superiors (2).

Distinctive Differences

Overall, Type I staff were neutral to teaching clients to confront those in power (38). All others avoided doing this. Teacher therapists more often avoided teaching clients how to keep records (51); giving the answers to client questions or finding someone who could (4); encouraging them to depend on the extension staff for answers (36); and helping them make agency contacts (24).

Type I personnel were most similar to types III and V in what they did. Type I was barely neutral to the use of confrontation tactics (38) compared to Type III personnel who were very strongly avoidant. In a similar manner Type I was mildly avoidant of mobilizing by-passed people for joint action (30). Type

III was adamantly so. Type I was agreeable to such milder tactics as organizing people into groups to achieve their own goals (13). Type III was at best neutral. On the other hand, Type I was more adamantly opposed to spending time teaching clients how to keep financial records (51) and allowing dependency relationships to develop (36). In this same vein, Type I was neutral towards giving the answers clients sought or finding someone who could (4). Type III stressed this activity.

In regard to Type I - Type V comparisons, Type I was in favor of helping clients define what their problems really are (3), Type V was opposed. Type I was mildly negative to helping keep things as they are if this is what clients want (16) and keeping a critical eye on what people propose to do and how they intend to do it (23). Type V was strongly negative toward these activities. Type V was also more strongly opposed to starting work with innovative and influential clients (14) and leaving things up to clients after telling them what to do (45) than Type I. Type I was more in favor of encouraging clients to consider possible alternatives (1) and teaching them to confront those in power (38) than Type V. On the negative side, Type I was much more avoidant of activities such as putting pressure on those who get in the way of extension (9); serving as local club leader or secretary (14); helping make agency contacts (24); or organizing clients to demand their rights (31). Avoided more by Type I than Type V were: reminding clients that help might be withdrawn if sufficient progress was not made (40); giving answers to clients or finding someone who could (4); and enlisting the help of the county court to keep extension areas clear (52).

Type II - Extensionist Teachers

Salient Characteristics. Extensionist teachers were also characterized by an emphasis on activities that were conducive to the personal development of

the client but unlike Type I, they also strongly emphasized supplying answers to client questions (4). They, like teacher therapists most emphasized visiting with and listening to clients (33). The teacher orietnation was further exemplified by a very strong emphasis on encouraging clients to consider possible alternatives (1) and helping them define what their problems really are (3). In further support of the information conveyor role of extension they placed a high emphasis on taking what extension has to offer to the people (35) and conveying research results from the university to those who could use it (48). For this they encouraged a working relationship with extension (39).

An egaliatarian stance was suggested by avoiding disproportionate attention to innovators and influentials in getting extension programs started (14). Also strongly avoided were such activities as: organizing clients to demand rights (41); mobilizing bypassed people to better demand their rights (30); helping them organize to achieve their objectives (13); and training local leaders to help with the extension programs (19). To a somewhat lesser degree they avoided accepting credit for extension program achievements (17); putting pressure on those who get in the way of extension (9); threatening to withdraw extension help if the client does not show sufficient progress (40) and leaving matters up to clients after telling them what to do (45). Serving as a local club leader or secretary (15) was also quite strongly avoided.

Distinctive Differences

Type II personnel were different from most others in that they were mildly inclined to keeping a critical eye on what people propose to do and how they

intend to do it (23) and helping families with personal problems (41). Others were mildly avoidant.

On the other hand, by comparison Type I quite strongly avoided working differentially with innovative and influential clients (14); helping clients organize to achieve their objectives (13); and training local leaders to hlep with extension's programs (19). Others tended to do these things more often. Teacher extensionists strongly avoided organizing clients to demand rights (31) others did also but not so strongly.

Type II extension workers were most similar to Type III. They were only moderately inclined to carrying out the directives of superiors (2). Group III substantially de-emphasized this. Type II slightly de-emphasized confrontation tactics (38,30) while Type III did so strongly. Type II was opposed to such activities as reminding clients that help might be withdrawn if they did not show progress (40) and putting pressure on those who get in the way of extension (9), but not as strongly as Type III.

On the do less often side, Type II, by comparison to Type III, avoided deference to innovators and local leaders in initiating extension programs (14). Type III was neutral. Type II steered away from training local leaders to help in extension (19) and from helping clients organize to achieve their own goals (13). Type III did both occasionally. Type II avoided involving clients in the planning of extension programs (20); working quietly behind the scenes to get programs moving (47); and relying heavily on local leaders (43). Type III was slightly inclined to doing these things.

Type II and Type IV were also similar but nevertheless differed on some things. While Type II was only mildly avoidant to enlisting the help of the county court to keep extension's area clear (52); enlisting the help of local leaders in protecting extension (50); planting ideas at strategic places where

extension might be helped (54); and reminding others what extension does to cut down interference (34); Type IV strongly avoided these activities. Extensionist teachers were mildly inclined to helping people with their personal problems (41) Type IV tended to avoid doing so.

Type II strongly avoided organizing clients to demand rights (31); starting work with the innovative and influential (14); and leaving clients after telling them what to do (45). Type IV was more strongly avoidant of these activities by comparison. Type II was inclined to avoid encouraging clients to depend on extension for answers (36); facilitating effective use of government resources (32); and keeping things as they are ever if clients so wanted (16). Type IV was somewhat inclined to doing these things. Type II was mildly inclined to working disproportionately with those who ask for help (5). Type IV strongly stressed this.

Type III People Oriented Problem Solvers

Salient Characteristics Activities most stressed by people oriented problem solvers were those central to a problem solving context in which people involvment and client ego-enhancement also figured strongly. They like so many others were strongly opposed to social action tactics involving confrontation of those in power; also, administrative tasks and the authoritarian use of their position.

More specifically, they strongly emphasized helping clients think through their problems (37); encouraging them to consider possible alternatives (1); visiting with and listening to them (33); answering the questions raised by them (4) and taking note of and expressing recognition of their achievements (18).

Two other activities stressed but not in the degree of those above were helping clients define what their problems really are (3) and involving them in planning and carrying out extension programs (20).

People oriented problem solvers like others avoided some activities. Most avoided were social activist tactics. Type III never or seldom mobilized by - passed people (30); organized clients to demand their rights (31); or taught them to confront those in power (38). Also in the never or seldom do category were such administrative or authoritarian activites as: reminding clients that help might be withdrawn if they did not show sufficient progress (40); putting pressure on those who get in the way of extension (9); telling clients what to do and leaving them to do it (45); and carrying out directives from superiors (2). Despite their avoidance of social action strategies, there was a feeling that things should not be kept as they are even if that is the way clients want it (16).

In a sense people oriented problem solvers, differed from others most on those things that they refrained from doing or seldom did than on what they did consistently. First of all, on the do side they differed from others by being neutral rather than strongly opposed to working disproportionately with highly innovative and influential clients (14). They were mildly inclined to teaching clients how to keep records (41). Others were negative. They more than others strongly avoided social action or reform activities in carrying out their Extension responsibilities.

Type IV - Public Servants

Salient Characteristics Public servants were characterized by a predominantly subserviant orientation to their clients and a very strong aversion to pressure tactics.

This predominant orientation was exemplified by a very strong emphasis on working mostly with those who ask for help (5); their emphasis on answering questions raised by clients (5); and concentrating mostly on just being on hand to help if and as needed (21).

Next in line and considerably stressed were such teaching-personal development activities as visiting with and listening to clients (33) encouraging them (1) and, helping them think through the consequences of what they propose to do (26).

Despite their basically passive orientation to their clients they placed considerable emphasis on helping to create an awareness of changes clients needed to make (22); and taking what extension has to offer to the public (35).

Type IV strongly de-emphasized enlisting the help of the county court to keep extension's area clear (52) and putting pressure on those who get in the way of extension (9). In this same area, enlisting the help of local leaders in protecting extension (50) and reminding others of what extension does to diminish interference (34) were also de-emphasized, all consistent with their passive service orientation. Public servants seldom planted ideas at strategic places where action might be taken to help extension (54) or accepted credit for extension program success (17). Other activities not stressed were such social action tactics as organizing clients to achieve their objectives (13) or demand their rights (31); and teaching clients to confront those in power (38). Consistent with their subserviant stance, they were not inclined to start working mostly with innovative and influential clients (14) or even to enlist the help of local groups in carrying out extension programs (44). Like so many, public servants avoided chores like serving as a local club leader or secretary (15).

Distinctive Differences Subserviant servants were neutral toward telling clients what to do and leaving it to them to do it (45). The others were strongly negative. Public servants were favorable to encouraging clients to depend on extension for answers (36). Again, others generally strongly rejected this. They strongly favored working mostly with those who asked for help(5). All others were only mildly so. This type strongly emphasized being

on hand to help if requested (21). The others were at best mildly favorable.

Public servants strongly avoided enlisting the county court's (52) or local leader's help (50) to mitigate infringement on extension's perrogatives; enlisting local groups in carrying out extension programs (44); and planting ideas at strategic places where action might be taken to help extension (54). The others occasionally did.

Type V Extension Activists

Salient Characteristics Extension activists (eager beavers) placed a high emphasis on doing extension work within the confines of the existing social structure - although they were about neutral to the use of social activist and pressure tactics of their own, they were not content to leave things as they are even if clients wanted it that way. At the top of the consistently do list were such teacher therapist (Type I) attributes as visiting with and listening to what the clients have to say (33) and raising questions to help them clarify their thinking (7). They were committed to finding or giving answers to questions clients raised (4) but were equally opposed to clients depending on them for answers to their problems (36).

As extension activists they were strongly inclined to taking extension to the people (35) and only slightly less so to helping them organize to achieve their own goals (13). In these respects they differed from most others. Their within system activistism was further indicated by strongly avoiding such things as helping keep things as they are even if clients wanted it that way (15). They seldom or never took this kind of a stance, neither would they tell clients what to do and leave the rest to them (46). Rather, they would visit with and listen to what they had to say and actively raise questions for which they would either give or find answers (4). Consistent with their orientation to change within the system, they were little inclined to keeping a protective eye on what clients were doing with the view of warning them

of impending dangers (23). Neither did they see much need for helping clients define what their problems really are (3).

Distinct Differences Type V differed from all others in that they were neutral toward organizing clients to demand their rights (31). The others were strongly avoidant. Extension activists were inclined to help clients organize to achieve their objectives (13) and accept credit for program achievement in extension (17). Others were less inclined to these activities. Type V was not as strongly avoidant of putting pressure on those who get in the way of extension (9) as were others.

Type V strongly avoided keeping a critical eye on what people propose to do and how they intend to do it (25); helping keep things as they are even if this is what clients want (16); and telling clients what to do and leaving it to them to do it (45). All others tended to do these occasionally.

Extension activists were most similar to Types I and III. But they differed substantially from People Oriented Problem Solvers (Type III with whom they were second most highly correlated) in their strong tendency to avoid helping clients define what their problems are and their less vehement opposition to pressure (9 and 40) and social activists tactics (31 and 30). Type V's differences from Type I were discussed under Type I.

(B) An Overall View

Table 3 indicates the degree to which the extension field staff (agricultural and community development specialists, and educational assistants in the small farmer program) stressed various activities when working with their clients. One designates most strongly avoid and 9 most strongly emphasize. Seven can be interpreted as nearly always do, 6 as generally do, 5 sometimes do and 4 or below in the avoid range. All the extension staff who completed questionnaires were included in this part of the analysis.

Only four role statements were given the rank of 7 or above by the total extension sample. The two highest among these were visiting with clients and listening to what they have to say (33); and encouraging them to consider possible alternatives before acting (1). Close in order was helping them think through their own problems as a basis for independent action (37). Third at an even 7.0 rating was giving or finding answers to client questions (4). The general people orientation already seen in the role type analysis was again clearly evident in the overall analysis. Noticeably absent was the man with a mission stance in which information from the university is regarded as the message about which clients are to be persuaded.

With 6.5 used as the next cutting point, there were 6 more very highly stressed role activities in which more of the same thing was apparent. This included helping clients define what their problems really are (3) and a number of activities designed to get information from the university to potential users; namely taking extension to the people (35); promoting the adoption of new practices recommended by the extension service (12); conveying research results from the university to clients who could use it (48); and encouraging a working, but not a dependency, relationship with extension (39). Also stressed was helping clients think through the consequences of what they propose to do (26).

Beyond this and still highly stressed (with 6.0 as the next cutting point) there were a number of activities which still supported the major orientations already noted. These included raising questions to help clients clarify their thinking (7), teaching them management and decisional skills (53), facilitating learning processes in which clients became both teacher and learner (56), and involving them extensively in planning and carrying out extension programs (20).

But, somewhat different orientations also emerged in near equal strength (i.e., at the lower end of the generally do level). This included something of a protective stance toward clients, manifested in an inclination to urge caution in the adoption of questionable innovations (8). A kind of missionary zeal was indicated by actively helping to create client awareness of changes they ought to make (22), but within their own definition of need (11). Finally, among agriculturalist in particular, there was a strong inclination to communicate information about problems back through researchers either directly or through campus based subject matter specialists (49).

They generally used appropriate opportunities to inform clients about extension programs, successes and needs (42), but only occasionally did they accept credit for extension program achievement as a means of getting public support (17), plant ideas at strategic places where they had reason to believe action might be taken on behalf of extension (54) or encourage leaders to promote, support for extension programs when their existence was threatened (28).

Differences There were some differences in the way the extension field staff operated but they were well within the client oriented teaching-problem-solving framework. Information dissemination was secondary and persuasion, when stressed at all, was in the context of what people wanted and thought they needed.

Interestingly enough, advice to exercise caution in the adoption of questionable innovations was strongly emphasized (8) particularly by the agricultural specialists. Thus, change for change's sake was not the gospel. Agricultural specialists and educational assistants were strongly inclined to providing answers to clients' questions (4) and to conveying research results from the university to those who might use it (48). Perhaps this was only natural because of the vast body of locally validated information upon which they were able to draw. Also, educational assistants and agricultural specialists were more active in communicating research needs back through the system to researchers (49).

By virtue of the nature of the diverse information base from which community development specialists worked, the relative absence of simple, locally adapted innovations to deliver, the complexity of the problems to be dealt with, the diversity of inputs necessary to implement programs and the integrative (putting together for local use) requirements for what they do, variations in role activities stressed did occur. But again this was within the confines of the same people oriented capacity building context.

They spent time raising questions to help clients clarify their thinking (7) and to help them define what their problems really are (3). But, most of all they encouraged clients to consider possible alternatives before acting (1) and interacting with them (33). This they stressed even more than others. They were also somewhat more inclined to facilitate learning processes in which clients become both teacher and learner (56) and serving as communication linkers among groups and agencies if and as needed (55).

Community development, government and agricultural specialists extensively involved clients in carrying out programs. Only educational assistants seldom did this. Also, in contrast to others, community development specialists were more strongly inclined to help clients achieve their objectives through

organized effort (13). Perhaps, by necessity, group involvement and group management were more stressed by them than the field staff associated with other groups.

Educational assistants, while very strongly emphasizing interaction with clients (33), helping them define their problems (3) encouraging them to consider alternatives (1), also very strongly stressed getting answers for them (4). Compared to other groups, they appeared to operate with a greater commitment and dedication to extension. They, more than others, worked harder at carrying out extension objectives (29) and encouraged clients more to establish working relationships with the extension services (39). Indeed, the last was very highly stressed.

They were more inlcined than others to teach skills, if and as needed (46); help clients keep income and expense records (51); and work at being accessible to clients if and when needed (21). In contrast to others they avoided interactive learning processes in which clients were both teacher and learner (56) and group involvement approaches generally (20 and 44).

We have already noted that variations in role type performance did occur. How these variations were aligned with extension specialty programs will ultimately be determined. But preliminary evidence indicates that divisions will by no means fall clearly along specialty lines.

IV. Summary and Conclusions

Questionaires completed by 130 Agricultural Specialists, 24 Community Development and 5 Local Government Specialists, and 34 Educational Assistants in the Small Farm Program provided frequency of use responses to 56 different ways of operating as an extension agent. Factor analysis of these responses defined 5 distinctive modes of operation. Briefly these were:

I Teacher Therapist- who emphasized visiting and listening to clients and teaching activities conducive to developing a capability to solve their own problems. Their mode of operation was basically egalitarian and orientated to people improvement rather than primarily to conveying university generated information and ideas to clients. They strongly avoided authoritarian and pressure tactics.

II Teacher Extensionist- who also strongly emphasized close personal interaction with clients and teaching activities conducive to their personal development, but, almost equally taking extension to the people and conveying university research results to clients. They were more prone than others to helping people with their problems and assuming a protective role on their behalf. Characteristically they also avoided social activism tactics.

III People Oriented Problem Solvers- who more strongly than others emphasized interaction with clients in solving their problems. They too, strongly avoided social activism tactics and authoritarian stances.

IV Public Servant- who stressed deference to the interests and requests of clients quite devoid of aggressive or self protective effort in relating to them. Activities most stressed were providing answers to questions that clients raised, working disproportionately with those who asked for help and concentrating being on hand to help if and as needed.

V Extension Activists- who more actively than others promoted client activity within the confines of the existing social system. They were aggressive in taking extension to the people and trying to activate latent client interests ultimately leading to action. They were impatient with leaving things as they are, even if clients wanted it that way. Not too different from the others, they stressed approaches that would help clients clarify their own thinking.

In the aggregate, the extension staff most emphasized roles conducive to developing the managerial and problem solving capabilities of their clients. They interacted with them, helped them think through their problems and encouraged them to take action on their own initiative. Secondarily, they operated as conveyors of information from the university. Extension field staff promoted the adoption of practices recommended by the extension service and took extension to the people. Within the context of these activities and through the existing social structure, the field staff tried to create an awareness of changes that clients ought to make.

Noticeably absent were elitist-authoritarian stances in which university based information was regarded as the message clients were to be persuaded to accept. Also absent were individual and group approaches designed to disproportionately benefit socially and economically bypassed people.

Variations in modes of operation by specialty area occurred within the context of an over riding deference to client needs and interests. An orientation to building people capacity through interaction which we thought might characterize community development specialists more than others, actually predominated for all. However, the emphasis was greater in community development. Agricultural specialists and educational assistants emphasized information conveyor and client protector roles more than in community development. They were also more inclined to communicate "in-field" informational needs back through the system to researchers either

directly or indirectly through campus based subject matter specialists.

Educational assistants were less inclined than subject matter specialists to involve clients in extension programs and training local leaders to help them in their work. Understandably they deferred more to the program directives of superiors than either community development or agricultural specialists.

Community development specialists (including 5 in local government) were more inclined than others to helping clients achieve their objectives through organized group effort and through establishing linkages among agencies necessary for completing projects undertaken.

We had expected agricultural specialists, who had a substantial body of locally validated information from which to draw, to operate mostly as hard sell information conveyors. Neither they nor any abstracted role type operated primarily in this manner. They reported regular performance of activities listed in 9 out of the 12 role categories. Many of these were egalitarian and distinctly people oriented.

Performance of many roles has been cited as an important explanation of the high achievement of county agents in years past. The significance of this contention is apparent when compared to oversimplified versions of the linking activity (between information source and user) observed elsewhere. While avoiding chore-like activities, the extension field staff still perform multiple roles. Back in "balanced farming" days, and again in the small farmer program, graduating farmers was and is being extolled as an ultimate extension goal. This implied building a capacity in clients to reason through and arrive at superior management decisions. Today the most stressed extension activities in all specialty areas seem conducive to this end.

REFERENCES

Abraham, R. H.
1963 "Dairy plant managers' perception of the Minnesota agricultural extension service." Madison: University of Wisconsin, unpublished Ph.D. Thesis.

Ashby, Eric
1962 "The administrator. Bottleneck or pump?" Daedalus (Spring): 264-278.

Beltran, Luis Ramiro
1976 "Alien premises, objects, and methods in Latin American communication research." Pp. 15-42 in Everett M. Rogers (ed.) Communication and Development. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications.

Brown, Emory J. and Albert Deckens
1958 "Role of the extension subject matter specialist." Rural Sociology 23 (March): 263-276.

Clark, David L. and Hopkins, John E.
1966 "Preliminary estimates of research, development and diffusion personnel required in education, 1971-72." Special Project Memorandum, School of Education, Indiana University. Bloomington, Indiana.

Coughenour, C. Milton
1968 "Some general problems in diffusion: From the perspective of the theory of social action." Pp. 5-21, North Central Regional Research Needs, University of Missouri Agricultural Experiment Station.

United States Department of Commerce
1977 1974 Census of Agriculture, Vol. 1, Part 25 Missouri State and County Data. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of the Census.

Emrick, John A.
1977 "Evaluation of the national diffusion network, Volume 1: Findings and recommendations." Menlo Park, California 94025: Stanford Research Institute.

Francis, David G. and Everett M. Rogers
1960 "Adoption of a nonrecommended innovation: The grass incubator." Paper presented at the Rural Sociological Society, University Park, Pennsylvania.

Havelock, Ronald G.
1971 "Planning for innovation through dissemination and utilization of knowledge (second printing). Ann Arbor, Michigan: Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.

Hildebrand, Peter E.
1977 "Benerating small farm technology: An integrated multidisciplinary system." Paper presented at 12th West Indian Agricultural Economics Conference, Antiqua.

Kerlinger, Fred N.
1972 'Q' Methodology in Behavioral Research. Pp. 3-38 in Steven R. Brown and Donald J. Brenner (eds.), Science, Psychology and Communication: Essays Honoring William Stephenson. New York: Teachers College Press.

1973 Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Lewin, Kurt
1963 "Forces behind food habits and methods of changing." In report of the Committee on Food Habits, The Problem of Changing Food Habits, Washington, D.C.: National Research Council, National Academy of Science.

Lionberber, Herbert F.
1974 "Organizational issues in agricultural communication." Pp. 144-158 in Robert H. Crawford and William B. Ward (eds.), Communication Strategies for Rural Development, Proceedings of the Cornell CIAT International Symposium, Cali, Colombia. Ithaca, NY, New York State College of Agriculture and Life Sciences.

1977 "Developing and disseminating information for modernizing societies: Toward an ideal systems model." Paper presented for a joint faculty-student seminar sponsored by the Center for International Programs and Studies at the University of Missouri, Columbia Campus.

Lionberger, Herbert F. and H. C. Chang
1970 Farm Information for Modernizing Agriculture: The Taiwan System. New York: Praeger Publishers, Inc.

Lippett, Ronald, Jeanne Watson and Bruce Westly
1958 The Dynamics of Planned Change. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, Inc.

Longwell, John H.
1970 "The centennial report 1870-1970 of the College of Agriculture, Columbia, Missouri." Technical Educational Services, University of Missouri.

Nielson, James
1967 "The change agent and the process of change." Research Bulletin 17, Michigan State University Agricultural Experiment Station.

Reiff, R. and F. Riessman
1964 "The indigenous non-professional: A strategy of change in community action and community mental health programs." National Institute of Labor Education 3 (November).

Rogers, Everett M.
1962 Diffusion of Innovations. New York: The Free Press of Blencoe.

1974 "Social structure and communication strategies in rural development: The communication effects gap and the second dimension of development." In Cornell CIAT International Symposium on Communication Strategies for Rural Development. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.

1976 Communication and Development. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications.

Rogers, Everett M., J. D. Eveland and Alden S. Bean
1976 "Extending the agricultural extension model." Stanford, California: Institute for Communication Research, Stanford University, Preliminary Draft.

Rogers, Everett M. and F. Floyd Shoemaker
1971 Communication of Innovations (second edition). New York: The Free Press.

Roling, Niels G., Joseph Ascroft, Fred Wachege
1976 "The diffusion of innovations and the issue of equity in rural development." Pp. 63-76 in Everett M. Rogers (ed.) Communication and Development. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications.

Shinge, P. M. and B. Mody
1976 "The communication effect gap: A field experiment on television and agricultural ignorance in India." Pp. 79-99 in Everett M. Rogers (ed.), Communication and Development. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications.

Stephenson, William
1953 The Study of Behavior: Q-Technique and its Methodology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Stone, John T.
1952 "How county agricultural agents teach." East Lansing: Michigan Agricultural Extension Service (mimeographed).

Tichenor, P. J.
1970 "Mass media flow and differential growth in knowledge." Public Opinion Q.34:159-170.

Wiggins, Edward R. and Duane Dailey
1974 "Missouri small farmers program, 1974 report." MP445. Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri, Extension Division.

Wilkening, Eugene A.
1956 "Roles of communicating agents in technological change in agriculture." Social Forces 34:361-367.

Wong, Tso Sang
1977 "Diffussing innovations in highly organized agriculture - the experience of communist China." Columbia: University of Missouri, unpublished paper.

TABLE 1. ELEMENTAL CONTENT, ROLE CATEGORIES AND OPERATIONAL ROLE TYPES THAT EMERGED FROM THE FACTOR ANALYSIS OF A SUBSAMPLE OF THE EXTENSION FIELD STAFF SELECTED FOR DIVERSITY OF OPERATION

Role Categories and Statements	Operational Roles				
	Type 1 Z-score avg.	Type 2 Z-score avg.	Type 3 Z-score avg.	Type 4 Z-score avg.	Type 5 Z-score avg.
Catalyst					
(6) Try to get clients who need assistance from extension to ask for it.	-0.1	0.5	0.2	0.6	0.3
(22) Help create an awarness of changes clients ought to make.	0.3	0.7	1.0	1.2	0.3
(47) Work quietly behind the scenes to get the extension program moving.	0.3	-0.5	0.7	0.5	0.3
(56) Facilitate the learning process to where clients become both teacher and learner.	0.9	-0.3	0.7	0.1	0.3
Social Facilitator (People Involvement)					
(25) Encourage clients with successful achievements to talk about them with people who can gain support for the extension program.	-0.2	0.5	0.2	-0.2	0.3
(43) Rely heavily on local leaders in carrying out the extension program.	0.3	-0.9	0.3	0.1	0.3
(44) Enlist the help of local groups and agencies in carrying out extension programs.	0.4	-0.3	0.3	-1.2	0.3
(14) Start working mostly with highly innovative and influential clients.	-0.3	-2.7	0.0	-1.4	-1.6
(20) Involve clients extensively in planning and carrying out the program.	0.9	-0.4	1.1	0.1	0.9
Linking (Systemic Linkage) Role					
(27) Help make contacts between groups and agencies so your clients can get the inputs they need to achieve their own goals.	0.8	0.2	0.0	0.5	0.3
(32) Facilitate effective use of resources available from government and private agencies.	0.5	-0.3	-0.1	0.9	0.3
(39) Encourage clients to establish working relationships with their cooperative extension service.	0.6	1.4	0.7	0.6	0.3
(55) Serve as a communication linking agent among groups and people when needed.	0.3	0.0	-0.1	0.0	0.3
Information Conveyor					
(4) Give the answers that farmers seek or find someone who can.	0.2	1.6	1.3	1.7	1.6
(12) Promote the adoption of new practices recommended by the extension service.	0.2	0.9	0.8	0.4	0.3
(48) Convey research results from the university to the clients who can use it.	0.4	1.1	0.8	0.7	0.3
(49) Communicate information about farm problems back to researchers directly or through the area specialists.	-0.3	0.3	0.5	0.7	0.0
Protector					
(8) Urge caution in the adoption of innovations of a questionable nature.	0.6	0.6	0.9	0.7	-0.1
(16) Help keep things as they are if the clients want it that way.	-0.3	-1.0	-1.3	0.1	-2.6
(23) Keep a critical eye on what people propose and how they propose to do it with the view of warning them when they are about to go wrong.	-0.4	0.3	-0.2	-0.2	-2.3
(26) Help farmers think through the consequences of the new things they are about to do.	1.1	0.9	0.8	1.1	0.3
Therapist (Ego Enhancement)					
(18) Take note of and express recognition for achievements that your clients make.	0.7	0.7	1.1	0.6	0.3
(33) Visit with your clients and listen to what they have to say.	2.0	1.8	1.3	1.2	2.2
(36) Encourage clients to depend on you for answers to their problems.	-1.8	-1.0	-0.8	0.4	-1.3
(41) Help farm families with their personal problems directly or through referral.	-0.6	0.5	-0.1	-0.5	-0.4
Teacher (Personal Development)					
(1) Encourage clients to consider possible alternatives before acting.	2.0	1.5	1.4	1.3	0.3
(3) Help clients define what their problems really are.	1.3	1.2	1.1	0.4	-1.2
(37) Help clients think through their problems, consider alternatives and act on their own initiative.	1.7	0.9	1.5	0.7	0.9
(7) Raise questions to help clients clarify their thinking.	1.2	0.4	0.6	0.6	1.8
Teacher (Trainer)					
(19) Train local leaders to help with the extension program.	0.4	-1.5	0.4	-0.9	0.3

TABLE 1. (cont.)

Role Categories and Statements	Operational Roles				
	Type 1 Z-score avg.	Type 2 Z-score avg.	Type 3 Z-score avg.	Type 4 Z-score avg.	Type 5 Z-score avg.
(46) Teach clients how to do what they have decided to do but lack skills for doing it.	0.5	0.5	0.2	0.4	0.0
(51) Teach clients how to keep farm income and expense records.	-2.1	0.2	0.3	0.3	-1.7
(53) Teach management and decisional skills to clients.	0.2	0.2	0.8	0.9	0.3
Boundary Maintenance					
(34) Remind others (people, groups and agencies) about what extension does as a means of cutting down interference from other agencies.	-0.5	-0.5	-0.7	-1.5	-1.1
(52) Enlist the help of the county court and extension councils in keeping lines clear between what extension is supposed to do and what other agencies think they should do.	-0.8	-0.4	-0.3	-2.6	0.3
(50) Enlist the help of local leaders in informing the public about what extension and other public agencies should do and in issuing reminders if necessary when the rights of extension are being infringed.	-1.0	-0.2	-0.5	-1.9	-0.4
Generalized Helper (Choreboy)					
(10) Help clients get the credit, services, and supplies they need to achieve their goals.	0.4	0.1	-0.3	0.1	0.6
(15) Serve as a local club leader or secretary when urged to do so.	-1.7	-1.3	-0.8	-1.3	0.0
(24) Make agency contacts, apply for and fill out forms to get the supplies and services clients need.	-1.2	0.0	-0.7	-0.2	0.3
(21) Concentrate mostly on being on hand to help if requested and needed.	0.1	0.7	-0.4	1.6	0.3
Administrator-Director					
(9) Put pressure on those who get in the way of carrying out extension programs.	-2.3	-1.2	-2.4	-2.2	-0.7
(45) Tell clients what to do and leave it up to them to do it.	-1.9	-1.4	-1.2	-0.1	-2.9
(40) Remind clients that extension help might be withdrawn if they don't show sufficient progress.	-2.3	-1.3	-2.5	-0.9	-0.9
(2) Work mostly at carrying out directives from you superiors.	-1.0	0.4	-1.5	0.5	-0.1
Lobbyist (Public Relations)					
(17) Accept credit for extension program achievement as a means of obtaining needed public support.	0.0	-1.2	-0.3	-1.2	0.8
(28) Encourage leaders to promote support for extension programs when its existence is being threatened.	-0.2	0.2	-0.1	-0.7	0.5
(42) Seek and use appropriate opportunityes to inform people about extension programs, success and needs.	0.4	0.8	0.4	0.3	0.3
(54) Plant ideas at strategic places where you have reason to feel action will be taken on behalf of extension.	-0.3	-0.2	0.0	-1.5	-0.1
Social Action					
(30) Mobilize by-passed people for joint action against those who take advantage of them.	-1.0	-1.6	-2.8	-0.9	-1.4
(31) Organize clients so they can better demand their rights.	-1.5	-2.5	-2.3	-1.2	-0.1
(13) Help clients organize groups to achieve their own objectives.	1.0	-1.6	-0.3	-1.0	1.3
(38) Teach clients how to best confront those in power to achieve their own ends.	0.1	-0.5	-1.9	-1.3	-1.4
Orientations					
Elitist vs. Grass Roots					
(11) Work mostly on achieving goals clients have set for themselves.	0.6	0.8	0.4	0.7	0.3
(29) Work mostly at carrying out extension program objectives.	-0.2	0.2	-0.1	-0.7	0.5
Take Extension to the People vs. They Come to Us					
(5) Work mostly with those who ask for help.	0.5	0.4	0.5	1.9	0.3
(35) Take extension (what it has to offer) to the people.	0.6	1.3	0.6	1.0	1.5

TABLE 2. INTER-CORRELATIONS OF EXTENSION ROLE TYPES IN THE WAY AGRICULTURAL AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SPECIALISTS AND SMALL FARMER EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANTS OPERATE IN THE FIELD

Role Types	Role Types (correlation coefficients)				
	1	2	3	4	5
1. Teacher Therapist	1.00	0.56	0.76	0.52	0.59
2. Teacher Extensionist	0.56	1.00	0.67	0.68	0.44
3. People Oriented Problem Solvers	0.76	0.67	1.00	0.59	0.53
4. Public Servants	0.52	0.68	0.59	1.00	0.33
5. Extension Activists	0.59	0.44	0.53	0.33	1.00

TABLE 3. AVERAGE RANK ASSIGNED TO EXTENSION ROLE STATEMENTS BY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SPECIALISTS, AGRICULTURAL SPECIALISTS AND EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANTS IN THE SMALL FARMER PROGRAM CLASSIFIED BY ROLE CATEGORIES

Role Categories and Statements	Average Rank Assigned by			
	Total Sample (N=193)	CD* Spec (N=29)	AG Sped (N=130)	ED Asst (N=34)
Catalyst				
(6) Try to get clients who need assistance from extension to ask for it.	5.7	5.2	5.7	6.3
(22) Help create an awarness of changes clients ought to make.	6.4	5.7	6.5	6.6
(47) Work quietly behind the scenes to get the extension program moving.	5.6	5.8	5.7	5.4
(56) Facilitate the learning process to where clients become both teacher and learner.	6.0	6.6	6.0	5.4
Social facilitator (People Involvement)				
(25) Encourage clients with successful achievements to talk about them with people who can gain support for the extension program.	5.4	5.2	5.4	6.0
(43) Rely heavily on local leaders in carrying out the extension program.	5.3	5.8	5.4	4.7
(44) Enlist the help of local groups and agencies in carrying out extension programs.	5.6	5.9	5.7	5.1
(14) Start working mostly with highly innovative and influential clients.	4.7	4.8	5.2	2.9
(20) Involve clients extensively in planning and carrying out the program.	6.1	6.8	6.2	5.2
Linking (Systemic Linkage) Role				
(27) Help make contacts between groups and agencies so your clients can get the inputs they need to achieve their own goals.	5.6	6.3	5.4	5.9
(32) Facilitate effective use of resources available from government and private agencies.	5.6	6.1	5.5	5.6
(39) Encourage clients to establish working relationships with their cooperative extension service.	6.6	6.0	6.5	7.2
(55) Serve as a communication linking agent among groups and people when needed.	5.5	6.0	5.3	5.8
Information Conveyor				
(4) Give the answers that farmers seek or find someone who can.	7.0	5.9	7.1	7.3
(12) Promote the adoption of new practices recommended by the extension service.	6.5	5.5	6.7	6.6
(48) Convey research results from the university to the clients who can use it.	6.7	5.9	6.8	6.8
(49) Communicate information about farm problems back to researchers directly or through the area specialists.	6.0	5.0	6.2	6.0
Protector				
(8) Urge caution in the adoption of innovations of a questionable nature.	6.4	5.9	6.5	6.4
(16) Help keep things as they are if the clients want it that way.	4.1	4.5	3.8	4.6
(23) Keep a critical eye on what people propose and how they propose to do it with the view of warning them when they are about to go wrong.	5.1	4.2	5.1	6.1
(26) Help clients think through the consequences of the new things they about to do.	6.6	6.6	6.6	6.8
Therapist (Ego Enhancement)				
(18) Take note of and express recognition for achievements that your clients make.	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.5
(33) Visit with your clients and listen to what they have to say.	7.5	8.0	7.3	7.7
(38) Encourage clients to depend on you for answers to their problems.	4.4	3.1	4.6	4.5
(41) Help farm families with their personal problems directly or through referral.	5.2	4.5	5.2	5.9
Teacher (Personal Development)				
(1) Encourage clients to consider possible alternatives before acting.	7.5	7.8	7.4	7.3
(3) Help clients define what their problems really are.	6.9	6.9	6.8	7.1
(37) Help clients think through their problems, consider alternatives and act on their own initiative.	7.3	7.4	7.5	6.8
(7) Raise questions to help clients clarify their thinking.	6.3	7.2	6.2	6.1
Teacher (Trainer)				
(19) Train local leaders to help with the extension program.	5.3	5.8	5.5	4.1

TABLE 3 (cont.)

Role Categories and Statements	Average Rank Assigned by: Total Sample (N=193)	CD* Spec (N=29)	AG Spec (N=130)	ED Spec (N=34)
(46) Teach clients how to do what they have decided to do but lack skills for doing it.	5.7	5.9	5.6	6.2
(51) Teach clients how to keep farm income and expense records.	4.7	2.6	4.8	5.9
(53) Teach management and decisional skills to clients.	6.0	5.7	6.1	5.9
Boundary Maintenance				
(34) Remind others (people, groups and agencies) about what extension does as a means of cutting down interference from other agencies.	4.3	4.6	4.1	4.6
(52) Enlist the help of the county court and extension councils in keeping lines clear between what extension is supposed to do and what other agencies think they should do.	4.6	4.4	4.6	4.9
(50) Enlist the help of local leaders in informing the public about what extension and other public agencies should do and in issuing reminders if necessary when the rights of extension are being infringed.	4.3	3.9	4.1	5.1
Generalized Helper (Choreboy)				
(10) Help clients get the credit, services, and supplies they need to achieve their goals.	5.3	5.8	5.0	5.7
(15) Serve as a local club leader or secretary when urged to do so.	3.9	3.2	4.0	4.2
(24) Make agency contacts, apply for and fill out forms to get the supplies and services clients need.	4.3	4.1	4.1	5.4
(21) Concentrate mostly on being on hand to help if requested and needed.	5.6	5.7	5.4	6.6
Administrator-Director				
(9) Put pressure on those who get in the way of carrying out extension programs.	2.7	2.5	2.5	3.6
(45) Tell clients what to do and leave it up to them to do it.	3.7	2.8	3.9	4.1
(40) Remind clients that extension help might be withdrawn if they don't show sufficient progress.	2.3	2.4	1.9	3.9
(2) Work mostly at carrying out directives from your superiors.	4.5	3.9	4.2	6.1
Lobbyist (Public Relations)				
(17) Accept credit for extension program achievement as a means of obtaining needed public support.	5.2	5.4	5.3	4.4
(28) Encourage leaders to promote support for extension programs when its existence is being threatened.	5.3	5.1	5.2	5.6
(42) Seek and use appropriate opportunities to inform people about extension programs, success and needs.	6.1	5.8	6.1	6.3
(54) Plant ideas at strategic places where you have reason to feel action will be taken on behalf of extension.	5.1	4.7	5.2	5.3
Social Action				
(30) Mobilize by-passed people for joint action against those who take advantage of them.	2.7	3.8	2.2	3.8
(31) Organize clients so they can better demand their rights.	2.6	3.3	2.3	3.0
(13) Help clients organize groups to achieve their own objectives.	4.9	6.6	4.7	4.1
(38) Teach clients how to best confront those in power to achieve their own ends.	3.8	5.0	3.4	4.6
Orientations				
Elitist vs. Grass Roots				
(11) Work mostly on achieving goals clients have set for themselves.	6.1	6.2	6.0	6.5
(29) Work mostly at carrying out extension program objectives.	5.9	5.6	5.9	6.4
Take Extension to the People vs. They Come to Us				
(5) Work mostly with those who ask for help.	6.3	5.9	6.4	6.3
(35) Take extension (what it has to offer) to the people.	6.7	6.3	6.7	5.9

* Includes 5 local government specialists.